

January 9, 1980

LB 634 - 644

RECESS

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: It is now 1:40 p.m. Will the Legislature please come to order and indicate your presence?

CLERK: Quorum present, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Do you have some new bills to read in?

CLERK: Yes, I do, if I may. LB 634, read title. LB 635, read title. LB 636, read title. LB 637, read title. LB 638, read title. LB 639, read title. LB 640, read title. LB 641, read title. LB 642, read title. LB 643, read title. LB 644, read title. (See pages 130-132, Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Fowler to proceed with the discussion on the rules.

SENATOR FOWLER: Okay, we have before us one final miscellaneous rule change, #7, and it deals with the question of calling the question. It indicates that the question shall be called only in the normal course of speaking order and then continues with our current rule that it shall be in order when demanded by five or more members. There is a typographical error in the second line. The "e" at the end of "or" should be dropped. I think that may be the old English spelling but we used a more modern approach so we might want to cross that out. Then the final addition is the presiding officer may rule the previous question out of order if in the presiding officers opinion a full and fair debate has not been afforded due to the complexity of the subject matter. The intent is to keep an individual from forcing a close on debate too early and to give the presiding officer discretion to allow full and fair debate. Now some members have expressed concern that perhaps that gives too much discretion to a presiding officer in that he may allow debate to go on and on and on and prevent us in the Legislature from being able to close debate. Now I think that is an outside chance that that would happen. However, Senator Beutler has a draft of an amendment to make it perfectly clear that this body could still overrule the presiding officer. I don't know if Senator Goodrich is here but he specifically was concerned about that and Senator Beutler has an amendment so we might...okay, the Beutler amendment I believe is being passed out. We might take that up. If the copy is before the Clerk, we could